

60,469-034  
OT-4705

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Zaharia  
SERIAL NO.: 09/778,481  
FILED: 02/07/2001  
EXAMINER: Salata  
GROUP ART UNIT: 2837  
FOR: ELEVATOR INSPECTION DEVICE ARRANGEMENT

*5/Request  
for  
Recor  
g. Septme  
6-26-02*

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

FAX COPY RECEIVED

Box AF  
Assistant Commissioner of Patents & Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

1 JUN 25 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Dear Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on April 30, 2002.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103, respectively.

*M. Dunn  
G. T. P.  
6/25/02*  
The specification clearly supports the claims. The specification provides several examples for utilizing the inventive strategy for placing a sensor in an elevator system to determine characteristics of the belt at the location(s) where the belt is most likely to wear. The claimed arrangement is utilized in different manners in each of the disclosed examples within the specification.

The Examiner now appears to be taking the position that one skilled in the art would already know how to practice Applicant's invention. If this is the case, the Examiner must present evidence from within the art that such is the case.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Yamazaki, et al. As previously pointed out, Yamazaki, et al. is concerned strictly with tension measurement. While there is one oblique reference in the background of the invention and one oblique reference within the detailed description to a relationship between tension and wear on a belt, those statements cannot possibly give rise to sufficient suggestion or motivation to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. The teachings of the Yamazaki, et al. reference are concerned strictly with tension on a rope

Docket No.: 60,469-034

and the determination of wear on a pulley or sheave in an elevator system. There is no discussion or suggestion within *Yamazaki, et al.* for determining an amount of wear of the belt (based upon tension, or otherwise) and there is no discussion or suggestion of taking into account various system variables to determine the best placement of a sensor for gathering information regarding the portion of a belt that is most likely to experience wear.

Applicant's claimed invention presents a new and useful approach to determining the best location for a sensor in an elevator system. This is not shown or discussed anywhere in the art. Moreover, the many examples given in Applicant's disclosure enable one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention by applying the teachings of the given examples and realizing the inventive approach can be used even in elevator systems that are not identical to the discussed examples.

With respect to the drawings, the only unlabeled boxes within the drawings left after Applicant's submission of proposed drawing corrections with the previous response were the sensor boxes 40 within each drawing. Enclosed are proposed drawing corrections having a label sensor written in red over each box numbered 40. Given the current size of such boxes in the drawings, the label extends beyond the box. Upon receipt a Notice of Allowance, the drawings will be formalized and the label will be contained completely within the box according to the Patent Office rules. Applicant submits the proposed drawing corrections as an informal correction so that the Examiner will be able to allow this case.


This case is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAX COPY RECEIVED

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. JUN 25 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER




David J. Gaskey  
Registration No. 37,39  
400 West Maple, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: June 25, 2002

Docket No.: 60,469-034

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 308-7724) on June 25, 2002.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Theresa M. Palmateer

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\p00034\PATENT\Request for Reconsideration.doc

FAX COPY RECEIVED

JUN 25 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800




Fig-1











Fig-2B



Fig-3AFig-3BFig-4A

Fig-4BFig-5AFig-5B




Fig-6A




Fig-6B